





So far as we can form an opinion from published documents, the Governor's conduct in relation to Indian lands has been highly culpable, and we see not how the President could have winked at it. But, as the Governor has no right to interfere with the Indian title, he has no right to commit an offence in one case, which he punishes in another. The army officers arraigned by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs are as culpable as the Governor; the whole correspondence proves this; let punishment be visited upon them all. It is, in appointing a surgeon to the Redoubt, in appointing a surgeon to lead the expedition, in appointing a man to lead the expedition at least to see us change for the worse in regard to Slavery. We are not an admirer of the present incumbent. Aside from his land speculations, he has, we think, fallen short of his duty to the actual settlers of Kansas. He ought never to have recognised the validity of the title of the Indians, who were a nation, a nation, stupendous fraud; he knew it, for such he proclaimed it; he had the power to set aside, and ought to have done it.

the election than that Territory. It was a palpable, stupendous fraud; he knew it, for such he proclaimed it; he had the power to set it aside, and ought to have done it.

Again: when he saw Kansas invaded, he had authority to apply to the President for help. Why did he not do so? And why, after having ordered a special election, did he leave Kansas to its fate, and return to Pennsylvania, instead of remaining on the spot, and taking measures in advance to guard the independence of the ballot-box?

For all these reasons, we are not prepared to join with some papers in regarding Governor

Reeder as a kind of martyr in the Cause of Freedom. That he sincerely desired Kansas to be free, that he took certain precautions to secure a free expression of opinion by the actual settlers, we cheerfully admit, but the crisis required a much bolder and more determined man.

Now, should the President appoint in his place one more acceptable to the Slavery Propagandists, the Public will justly infer that the removal of Governor Reeder was not dictated by a sense of Justice, but by a corrupt desire to please the South and Messrs. Atchison and Stringfellow.

LET US UNDERSTAND EACH OTHER.

A word to our friend G., of the *Ashabulia Sentinel*. He has either misunderstood us, or we have misunderstood him. If he is in favor of a reorganization of the Political Anti-Slavery Movement, on the same general principles, with the same general object, and operating by the same general methods as characterized by the *Standard* in 1832 and 1848, then we are at one. But if he is for a nondescript, indefinite, half-way sort of movement, that, while professing great independence of the Know Nothing Order, shall in fact be controlled by it, then we are against him.

*National Era.*

We have no re-organization to ask. We are already organized. Our Republican party of

last year, organized on the proper basis. The President and his party had declared for *sustaining and extending slavery by the Federal Government*. The Republicans, on the other hand, had definite and distinct issues on that proposition, leaving Slavery to the States, they intend to wield the final power for Freedom only. This is the issue between the Administration and the Republicans. We therefore go for sustaining the Republican party as formed, or the issue which was then adopted, and opposing all efforts to modify that issue or to adopt others on which we may disagree. Ours is neither a "nondescript, indefinite, nor half-way movement." Its character is that of a *positive* movement, and it will not be controlled by Know Nothings.

*Ashtabula (O.) Sentinel.*

Let us understand each other. If G. read our astle, he must have seen our subject was *National, not State* action. We insisted on a reorganization of the Political Anti-Slavery Movement, for the Presidential campaign. He answers, by saying that they have, in Ohio, a Republican Party, which needs no reorganization! We speak of one thing—he answers us by talking of another.

Now, so far as the States are concerned, we wish our friends all success in honest and wise efforts to secure a Party of Freedom, whether they call it Republican, or Independent Democratic, an existing organization, or a reorganization. That, however, is not the question.

There is no National Organization," of any kind, which proposes the establishment of Freedom, as the law of the Federal Government. There is a National Old Line Democratic Party; and we have now a National Know Nothing Party. If the Anti-Slavery voters intend to act with neither of these, what do they intend to do? Why talk of "Fusion?" Do they expect to fuse with the Old Line Democrats or National Know Nothings? All voters in the Free States, outside of these organizations, are pretty well *fused* already. The thing they need is *organization*. Now, has G. any other plan to propose, than "a Political Anti-Slavery Move-

ment, on the same general principles, with the same general object, and operating by the same general methods as characterized it in 1852 and 1848?" If he has, let him propose it—if he has not, let him say whether he is with us or not. If the old, experienced Anti-Slavery men do not take the lead, who will? And is it not high time, when Slavery and Hankerism are concentrating their forces and organizing for the campaign of 1856, that we should be at least comparing opinions, and working for united action? Have our friends condescended to await the decision of the Know Nothing Councils in the Free States, so as to assent to them the lead?

For one, let us say distinctly and emphatically, we will never support any organization, let it be as loud as it may in its Anti-Slavery professions, which embraces or countenances *Secrecy* in method, or *Discrimination* in natural or political rights, on account of color, birth, or religion. If voters, who have heard styled Whigs, Democrats, or Know Nothings, will unite in open, independent, direct action, in favor of Freedom, and against Slavery, without the attempt to make such union minister to other organizations with which they may be associated, we can act with them; but, let not the Know Nothings of the free States

delude themselves with the notion that they can rally the masses of the North and West under their banner. They cannot do it: we trust, the majority of them are convinced of this; and we hope that they will consent to give up at once their organization, and join heartily and honestly in a real Party of Freedom.

So much as to National action. Now, as to State action. If a citizen of Ohio, our motto would be, co-operation with *individuals*, in a *Party of Freedom, Now and Always*; but, co-operation with *Know Nothings*, as a *Party*, *Never!*

We are not sorry to see that the Independent

Democrats have called a Mass State Convention, to meet at Columbus, on the 13th, the day of the meeting of the delegate Republican Convention.

If the action of the latter be open, honest, and single-eyed, they will ratify it; if otherwise, they will be on hand to mark out their own line of policy. It is all well enough to insist upon forgetting and sinking differences of opinion on non-essentials, but let no true Liberty Man permit himself to be driven into any arrangement implying a sanction to Know Nothingism. "Co-operation," as it is called, may prove a snare. As a matter of fact, we

suppose there are but two actual States in Ohio—The Old Line Democracy, and the Know Nothing Party. Of course, when co-operation is talked of, it has no reference to action with the former. What, then, is it? May it not prove simply an aggregation







